IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION No.408 of 2007

Pandurang Hanumant Dighe ..Applicant.

Vs.

Chingabai Tukaram Aaglave & Ors. ..Respondents.

Mr Rupesh Bobde i/b Umesh Mankapur, Advocates
for the Applicant.

Mr K. V. Saste, APP for the Respondent-State

CORAM: V. C. DAGA,J.
DATED: 3rd Sept, 2007.

P.C.:-

1. Heard.

2. Perused record.

3. This revision petition is directed against judgment and order dated 4.5.2007 in Sessions Case No. 144 of 2006 passed by the IV Ad-hoc Additional Sessions Judge, Kolhapur; whereby, the respondent Nos. 1 to 3 have been acquitted for the offence punishable under Sections 498-A, 306 of the I.P.C.

4. After having perused the order challenged, I do not see any perversity in the said order. The learned counsel for the applicant could not point out any perversity

or that any particular piece of evidence has not been appreciated by the Trial Court. The Court below has appreciated the evidence in its proper perspective. Thus, the view taken by the Court below is reasonable and possible view.

5. This Court not being a Court of appeal cannot substitute its own view in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Revisional jurisdiction is not only limited in scope but also is discretionary. The Court interferes in the revisional jurisdiction only in exceptional cases of flagrant miscarriage of justice as held by the Apex Court in the case of **State of Rajasthan v. Gurucharandas Chaddha, AIR 1979 SC 1895.**

6. In the above view of the matter, no case is made out to interfere with the impugned order. In the result, the revision application has no merit. Same is accordingly dismissed with no order as to costs.

(V.C. DAGA,J.)